REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 and 32-51 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 32, and 42 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated January 6, 2010, Claims 1-20 and 32-51 were objected to, Claims 1, 32, and 42-43 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, and Claims 1-20 and 32-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 and 32-54 remain in this application with Claims 52-54 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 1, 2010, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the claims as amended overcome the current rejections. No patentability agreement was reached.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under the Doctrine of Double Patenting

In the Final Office Action dated January 6, 2010, the Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1, 32, and 42-43 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 42 of copending U.S. Patent

Application No. 12/028,797. The Examiner has stated that a timely filed Terminal
Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome this rejection.
Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance until
allowable subject matter has been indicated.

III.   Objection to the Claims

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1-20 and 32-51 as
allegedly containing various informalities. Though Applicants respectfully disagree with
these objections, Claims 1, 32, and 42 have been amended to further clarify the alleged
informalities and do not narrow the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully
submit that the amendments overcome this objection and add no new matter.

IV.   Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16-21, 32-36,
38-46, 48-49 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent
Publication No. 2005/0039142 ("*Jalon*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.
2005/0057584 ("*Gruen*") and *Building Java Enterprise Systems with J2EE*,
("*JavaBeans*"). In addition the Examiner rejected dependent Claims 8 and 15 under 35
U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of *Gruen*, *JavaBeans*, and
Microsoft Outlook Screen Dumps ("*MS Outlook*"), dependent Claims 9, 37, and 47
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of *Gruen*,
JavaBeans, *MS Outlook*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,943,051 ("*Onda*"), and dependent
Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalon* in view of U.S.

Patent No. 7,039,596 ("*Lu*"). Claims 1, 32, and 42 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein displaying each selected calendar in the view frame simultaneously comprises displaying the first selected calendar at the indicated view mode with each selected shared calendar being aligned at the same indicated view mode as the first selected calendar, the view mode indicating the position of display within the calendar." Amended Claims 32 and 42 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 2, line 5 – page 3, line 30.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Jalon* at least fails to disclose receiving view information for displaying selected calendars simultaneously. (*See* Office Action page 5, paragraph 2.) Consequently, because *Jalon* fails to disclose receiving view information for simultaneous calendar display, *Jalon* cannot disclose aligning calendars that are simultaneously displayed based on the view information. The Examiner relies on *Gruen* to overcome *Jalon's* deficiencies, contending that *Gruen* discloses view information for simultaneous calendar display. Applicants respectfully submit that, even if the Examiner's contention is true, *Gruen* still fails to disclose aligning calendars at a common position for simultaneous display.

For example, *Gruen* merely discloses a calendar bar that provides a means for conveniently displaying calendars while viewing electronic mail. (*See* paragraph [0100].) While *Gruen* goes further to disclose that a personal calendar may be

displayed simultaneously with a team calendar to which the user belongs (*see* paragraph [0100]), *Gruen* fails to disclose aligning simultaneously displayed calendars at, for example, a common time period. Rather, *Gruen* merely discloses displaying multiple calendars simultaneously and is silent regarding simultaneous display alignment.

Furthermore, *JavaBeans* does not overcome *Jalon's* and *Gruen's* deficiencies. For example, *JavaBeans* merely discloses a model for developing server-side enterprise application components that can make building portable and distributed enterprise applications an easier task. (*See* Chapter 36: Modeling Components with Enterprise JavaBeans, paragraph 1.) Nowhere does *JavaBeans* disclose aligning simultaneously displayed calendar at, for example, a common time period. Rather, *JavaBeans* merely discloses basic architecture and concepts involved in building enterprise application components.

Combing *Jalon* with *Gruen* and *JavaBeans* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Jalon*, *Gruen*, and *JavaBeans*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose "wherein displaying each selected calendar in the view frame simultaneously comprises displaying the first selected calendar at the indicated view mode with each selected shared calendar being aligned at the same indicated view mode as the first selected calendar, the view mode indicating the position of display within the calendar," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 32 and 42 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 32, and 42 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited

art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 32, and 42.

Dependent Claims 2-20, 33-41, and 43-51 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 32, and 42, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 32, and 42. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-20, 33-41, and 43-51.

V.   New Claims

Claims 52-54 have been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Support for claims 52-54 may be found in the specification in at least Figure 3 and pgs. 3:10-15, 9:14-26, 11:20-25, 15:15-2. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable over the cited art and that they add no new matter.

VI.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore,

the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 6, 2010

/D. Kent Stier/
_____

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE